

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending as of the office action mailed March 31, 2008.

Claims 1- 31 are being amended. Support for the amendments can be found in, for example, page 8 of the specification. No new matter is being added.

New claim 32 is being added. Support for the new claim can be found in, for example, page 9 of the specification

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claim 8 was objected to for an informality. Claim 8 is being amended to correct the informality. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

§ 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Lowthert (US 2002/0095675). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is being amended to recite, in part, "receiving one or more advertisements from a plurality of advertisements to be displayed on the video event display system, wherein the advertisements are selected from a plurality of advertisements based on the requested video event."

The Applicant respectfully submits that Lowthert does not teach this feature. The Examiner cited Lowthert paragraphs 0037-0038 in rejecting the claim. Lowthert paragraphs 0037-0038 discloses mining user preference information (e.g., web sites visited) at the receiver for the local guide to advertising resources, and the use of preference information to determine which ads to use as advertising inserts. The relied upon portion of Lowthert does not teach or suggest determining advertising inserts or selecting advertisements based on the content that the

user requested to be displayed on the receiver. On the other hand, the claim recites that the advertisements are selected based on the requested video event. Thus, Lowthert does not anticipate claim 1.

Claims 2-12, 32

Claims 2-12, and new claim 32 depend from claim 1, and are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 13

Claim 13 is being amended to recite that the advertisements are selected from a plurality of advertisements based on a requested video event. As described above with respect to claim 1, the relied upon portions of Lowthert do not disclose this feature. Thus, claim 13 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 14-24

Claims 14-24 depend from claim 13, and are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 13.

Claim 25

Claim 25 recites "loading one or more advertisements from a plurality of advertisements stored on the local storage device to the video event display system." The Examiner had rejected claims 1, 13, 25, 31 together under a common rationale, but did not address the specific limitation in the above recitation. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the relied upon portions of Lowthert have not been shown to anticipate claim 25. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 26-30

Claims 26-30 depend from claim 25, and are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 25.

Claim 31

Claim 31 is being amended to recite that the advertisements are selected from a plurality of advertisements based on a requested video event. As described above with respect to claim 1, the relied upon portions of Lowthert does not teach or suggest this feature. Thus, claim 31 is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Applicant : Daniel Willis
Serial No. : 10/775,247
Filed : February 11, 2004
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 16113-0681001 / GP-1090-00-US-CIP

The required fee for \$50 for additional claim fee is being submitted herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2 September 2008

Andrew Leung
Andrew H. Leung
Reg. No. 55,374

Customer No. 26192
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50483425.doc